

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



March 12, 2004

Agenda ID #3338

TO: PARTIES OF RECORD IN CASE 89-10-054

This is the proposed decision of Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Patrick. It will not appear on the Commission's agenda for at least 30 days after the date it is mailed. The Commission may act then, or it may postpone action until later.

When the Commission acts on the proposed decision, it may adopt all or part of it as written, amend or modify it, or set it aside and prepare its own decision. Only when the Commission acts does the decision become binding on the parties.

Parties to the proceeding may file comments on the proposed decision as provided in Article 19 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rule). These rules are accessible on the Commission's Website at <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov>. Pursuant to Rule 77.3 opening comments shall not exceed 15 pages. Finally, comments must be served separately on the ALJ and the Assigned Commissioner, and for that purpose I suggest hand delivery, overnight mail, or other expeditious method of service.

/s/ ANGELA K. MINKIN
Angela K. Minkin, Chief
Administrative Law Judge

ANG:hkr

Attachment

Decision **PROPOSED DECISION OF ALJ PATRICK** (Mailed 3/12/2004)

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Utility Design, Inc. and Utility Contractors, Inc.,

Complainants,

vs.

Pacific Gas and Electric Company,

Defendant.

Case 89-10-054
(Filed October 31, 1989)

(See Appendix A for List of Appearances.)

OPINION CLOSING PROCEEDING

Summary

Since the parties indicate no further interest in litigating this complaint case, the proceeding is closed.

Discussion

At the request of the parties, the processing of this complaint case was deferred pending completion of the Line Extension Rules proceeding, Rulemaking (R.) 92-03-050. Following completion of that proceeding, the assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) issued a ruling on January 15, 2004, requesting Complainants to advise the Commission whether this complaint case should be closed because the matters at issue had been addressed in the Commission's decisions in R.92-03-050. No response was received. Therefore,

we conclude that there is no further interest in this case and the proceeding should be closed.

Comments on Proposed Decision

The proposed decision of the ALJ in this matter was mailed to the parties in accordance with Pub. Util. Code § 311(d) and Rule 77.1 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. Comments were filed on _____ and reply comments were filed on _____.

Assignment of Proceeding

Geoffrey F. Brown is the Assigned Commissioner and Bertram D. Patrick is the assigned ALJ in this proceeding

Finding of Fact

Complainants have not indicated an interest in proceeding with this complaint case.

Conclusion of Law

This proceeding should be closed.

O R D E R

Therefore, **IT IS ORDERED** that Complaint Case 89-10-054 shall be closed.

This order is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

APPENDIX A
LIST OF APPEARANCES

Louis E. Vincent
Attorney At Law
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PO BOX 7442
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94120
(415) 973-2981
lev1@pge.com

Roger L. Poynts,
Connie Easterly
UTILITY DESIGN, INC.
5520 PACHECO BLVD.
PACHECO, CA 94553-5126
(925) 674-0218
poynts@udi-tetrad.com
For: UTILITY DESIGN, INC.

(END OF APPENDIX A)